Perusal

App. F. IX-4

Previous References

1933
(Muzrai)

File No. 312-33
Serial Nos. 1-4

Later References.
Pa 5-35

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 4.

Part B for January 1933

SUBJECT.

Appeal re the archaks office in Sri Ranganatha Swami temple Seringapatam

To. A:R. Nageswara Ayr Advocate Bangr

No 588 of 10-1-33

WD 01965—GPB—15,000—7-7-34

8/24.

States that there are reasons to interfere
with the concurrent orders of the Dy Comr + Muz Comr
Copy to the Muz Comr 590 of 10-1-33

Mag Appl No. 7 of 33-34 re: The Circuit Office in Sri Rangamathaswamy temple Srirangapattanam

General and Revenue Secretariat — Mag File No. 312 of 1933-4 — [App. F. III—2

Serial No.	
1	Petition dy 26.7.33 filed by Mr A. R. Nageswara Iyer Advocate Bangalore city on behalf of his client Sri Rangaraja Bhatta appealing against the decision of the Magl Commissioner in Mag. Appeal No. 6 of 1931-32 re: The Circuits Office in Sri Rangamathaswamy temple at Srirangapattanam (1) The decision of the M.C. is dated 12/5/33 and 4 weeks time has been taken by the M.C's Office for granting The Copy applied for by Sri Ranga Raja Bhatta. The appeal is presumed in and the fee is sufficiently stamped. For orders if it may be admitted & records. GN 28/8 The records may be called for. 29/8/33 Je Secy) Yes. 30/8/33 Memo or formal form may be issued for issue signature. GN 30/8 30/8/33 Send to [illegible] 31/8

NOTE—Contin. Sheet.

WD 70—GBPM—60,000—13-8-31.

Revn Appl 70 of 33-34

File No. 312 of 1933	General and Revenue Secretariat

Letter no 372/33-34 dy 18.12.33 from the Mysore Commissioner forwarding records relating to the appeal preferred by Sri Rangaraja Bhatta in respect of his claim to the archakship of Sri Ranganathaswami temple at Srirangapatna —

The S.D.O. Hunsur Rocks Moore has held after an elaborate enquiry in his order dy 12/5/30 that it is not just to terminate the appointment of Lakshmana Bhatta (counter petr) at once, he may be continued to look after the duties assigned to him as long as he is fit & when the office is vacated owing to old age etc the petr Sri Rangaraja Bhatta is to be allowed to take up the office of archakship after the approval of the concerned authorities.

Against the above decision Lakshmana Bhatta appealed to the DC, Mysore Dt., who in his order dy 10.6.31 set aside the order of the S.D.O directing Sri Rangaraja Bhatta to be made the karavo of the Swami Sannidhi of Sri Ranganathaswami temple & allowed the appeal.

Sri Rangaraja Bhatta then went in appeal before the HC who upheld the decision of the DC & dismissed the appeal.

The present appeal is now preferred by Sri Rangaraja Bhatta against the above order of the HC

General and Revenue Secretariat

File No. of 193

Serial No.

Mem Appl 7 of 33-34
re: the claim of Sri Rajaraja Khatta terms ... Kapp. P. III-2
Sri Rajaraja Khatta terms ... Tola.

10) To docs if the case may be posted for a hearing —

GS 29/1

25

11) Please post up Mag Supts order dt 29. 1. 95 upto in the M.C. order. 10/1/34

x W.

chuz. Supts order of 29. 1. 1895 is in original among the Vernacular records received from the M.C. & is flagged. W — Noted with regd to para 11 supra —

GS 12/1

13

The M.C. order which is now appealed against is flagged K. It explains very clearly all the facts of the case.

(ii) The points urged in the appeal petn in support of the appeal are :—

1) That there is no warrant for the statement in the order of the M.C. both in 1895 on acct of the misbehaviour of Narasimha Khatta he was dismissed from the office of the poojari and the vacant post was conferred on Keshava Khatta (para 5 of the appeal petn). And

2) That the M.C. erred in holding that Narasimha Khatta left the office & died 15 years before his death & that as there was no heir when the post fell vacant it was filled up by the appt of another person (para 7 of the petn).

As regards (1) kindly refer

NOTE—Contn. Sheet.

W D 70—GBPM—460,000—13-8-34.

No 7 of 1933-34

Mug Appeal petn of Sri Rangaraja Bhn
& about the archakship
temple Seringapatana

File No. of 193 General a Sec

is limited to the Mug Suit's order of 1895 (Flag W) and the correspondence leading to it. In the Hon S. Dos report dt 12.12.94 it is stated as follows: — [illegible] (Flag E. Alamelu in his report dt 16.12.94 it is stated as follows: — [illegible] (Flag D)

[illegible]'. There are besides other reasons the Narasanja Bhatas dismissal for office in the records. As such point No ① in the appeal petn cannot stand.

As regards point ② it is clear from the order that the appellant was adopted by Narasanja Bhatas wife two years after the death of Narasanja Bhatta in 1910. This the death of Narasanja Bhatta having left his wife in 1894 and Keshava Bhatta (Respondents father) having been appointed by the Mug Suit, it is by no means clear how the Mr has erred.

In view of the above the appellant has no case. It is for orders if the case may be posted for hearing or the appeal rejected on perusal of records.

17/1/34

SECTION OF THE SUPERINTENDENT OF COURTS
19 JAN. 1934
BANGALORE

Maybe

Mr 18-1-34.

posted

24/1/34

19/1

Mr 25-1-34

Mis appl no 7

General and Revenue Secretariat | File No. 312 of 193 | [App. F. III—2

Serial No.	
4671 4/6.	19) Counsel for both parties present & heard order reserved. SPR 4/8/34
	Order — 20) I see no reason to interfere with the concurrent orders of the D C & the Hon'ble Com ✓ SPR 30/12/34 RR 5/1/35 5/1/35
	D/2 read GVS 7/1 GRC 7/1/35
4	No 988 dy 10.1.35 to Mr A. R. Nageswara Rao Advocate for the appellant forwarding Copy of the orders passed in the appeal case — No 989 dy 10.1.35 to Mrs H. V. Krishna Rao Advocate for the respondent forwarding Copy of the orders passed in the Case. No 990 dy 10.1.35 to the Govt

NOTE— Contn. Sheet.

WD 0434—GPB—15,000—12 10-32

Mez Appl No 79 1933-34

701-33

Mez File No. of 193

General and Revenue Secretariat

Serial No.	
	Commissioner forwarding copy of the orders passed on the case and returning the records received from him.
	25/1/35

312-33-1



GEN'L 149 AUG. 1933

Before the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore, Bangalore.

Muzrai Appeal 7 of 1933-34.

====

Sri Rangaraja Bhatta ... Appellant

Vs.

Lakshmana Bhatta ... Respondent.

Appeal against ~~the Order of~~ the Order of the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore, Bangalore, in Muzrai Appeal No.6 of 1931-32 regarding the Archak's Office in the Srirangapatam Sri Ranganathaswami Temple.

====

1. The appellant is the adopted son of Narasaraja Bhatta who was the Archak in Sri Ranganathaswami Temple at Seringapatam, under a Nirupa from His Highness the late Sri Krishnaraja Wadayar Bahadur.

2. The Respondent is the son of one Kesava Bhatta who was admittedly appointed Gumasta Archak, by appellant's father, Narasaraja Bhatta. These are admitted facts.

3. As the appellant was by virtue of his adoption entitled to the office in -- question he filed an application to be -- appointed for the post and the learned Sub Division Officer of Seringapatam after --

after considering all the points involved held in favour of the appellant.

4. The learned Deputy Commissioner mainly on some presumptions not warranted by the admitted and proved facts set aside the order of the Sub Division Officer and passed an order in favour of the Respondent. The appellant then filed an appeal before the Muzrai Commissioner who has similarly upheld the order of the learned Deputy Commissioner. Hence this appeal.

5. There is absolutely no warrant for the statement in the order of the learned Muzrai Commissioner that in 1895 on account of the misbehaviour of Narasaraja Bhatta, he was dismissed from the Office of Pujari and the vacant post was conferred on Kesava Bhatta. No such order of dismissal has been produced and the learned Muzrai Commissioner has not correctly construed the order of the Muzrai Superintendent dated 29th January 1895. Even conceding that Narasaraja Bhatta was dismissed, there is no reason to presume that the family Hak was forfeited and the right of the appellant cannot be denied since the office is hereditary to his family. The learned Muzrai Commissioner has not given due weight to the fact that even in the Melkote Temple where he was removed, Narasaraja Bhatta's widow was called upon to name a successor to him after his death.

6. The learned Muzrai Commissioner is completely in error when he says that the local officers set about finding the heir of Kesava Bhatta and not of Narasaraja Bhatta when Kesava Bhatta was removed for unsatisfactory conduct viz., gambling &c., On the other hand the order clearly shows that the Local Authorities

Authorities suggested the name of an entirely different person and that the respondent was temporarily appointed purely on the ground of expediency. Further the respondent himself does not claim the office from his father and claims in his own right, for which he was absolutely no documentary evidence.

7. The learned Muzrai Commissioner has erred in holding that Narasaraja Bhatta lost the office - nearly 15 years before his death and that as there was no heir when the office fell vacant, it was filled up by the appointment of another person.

8. The learned Sub Division Officer has given very convincing reasons for appointing the appellant and the documentary evidence produced by the appellant fully supports his decision.

9. The order of the learned Deputy and Muzrai Commissioners are otherwise erroenous and inequitable.

10. The appellant prays that the appellant may kindly be heard in the case and that the order of the Muzrai Commissioner may kindly be set aside and the appellant appointed to the Office in question.

H/ T.V.S.
C 372
33-34

OFFICE OF THE MUZRAI COMMISSIONER IN MYSORE BANGALORE
No. ...
1 SEP 1933

Bangalore,
2-7-33.

274/Muz & 31-8-33.

Forwarded with Compliments to the Muzrai Commissioner for Submission of the entire records connected with the above Appeal.

By order
31/8/33
for Financial Secretary to Govt

TWO RUPEES

~~In the High Court of Mysore.~~

Before The Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

Muz. A. NO OF 1933 1934

Appellant	Respondent
Sree Rangaraja Bhalla	Lakshmanabhatta

VS.

I the appellant above named, do hereby nominate and appoint Mr. A. R. Nagesvara Iyer B. A., B. L., and L. Krishnaswamy Rao, B.A. LL.B. Advocates in the above suit and do hereby empower the said Advocates to appear for and on my behalf in the above suit, to take all steps which may be necessary on my behalf arising out of or in connection with the above suit either during progress or after its decision, to sign and subscribe their names to any document which they may deem proper, to execute any decree that may be passed in my favour and to receive out of the Court any refund of money which may be lodged or become payable or receivable on my behalf and on receipt thereof to grant receipt or other sufficient discharges for the same, to withdraw, compromise or refer to arbitration the said suit, to appoint one or more substitutes and to act and perform all other matters and things relating thereto or connected therewith, to represent me in matters relating to the same and to act as fully and effectually to all intents and purposes as I might do if personally present and did the same. And I do hereby agree to pay all fees, costs, charges and expenses which may be incurred and to allow, ratify, and confirm whatsoever the said Advocates shall lawfully do or cause or procure to be done by the virtue of these presents.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand this 26th day of July 1933

ACCEPTED

Advocates for appellant.

Signed before me by the executant who is known to me

In the Court of the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore, Bangalore

Muzrai Appeal No. 6/31-32

Appellant — Srirangarajabhatta, Sri Narayanaswamy Temple, Melkote

Vs.

Respondent — Lakshmanabhatta, archak, Sri Ranganatha-swamy Temple, Seringapatam

Subject — Appeal against the order of the Deputy Commissioner, Mysore District setting aside the order of the Sub Division Officer directing the appellant to be made the barawardar of the archakship of the Swami Sannidhi of Sri Ranganathaswamy Temple, Seringapatam.

Facts of the Case. — The baraward of Swami Sannidhi puja of Sri Ranganathaswami Temple, Srirangapatam, was in the name of one Narasarajabhatta from 1878-95 and Kesavabhatta father of the respondent was acting for him. In 1895 Narasarajabhatta's name was omitted and Kesavabhatta was shown as barawardar. After the death of the original barawardar in 1910 his wife took the appellant in adoption in 1912. On account of his bad Conduct Kesavabhatta was removed from his gumasta post in 1897 and the respondent-his son was made to act in the vacancy as an emergent and tentative measure. This arrangement continued till 1926 when the appellant as adoptive son of the original barawardar petitioned the Amildar to make him the barawardar of the temple. A regular enquiry was held and a report submitted that as Kesavabhatta was shown as barawardar in 1895 by mistake, his name may be removed and the appellant made the barawardar, continuing the respondent as gumasta. The Sub Division Officer observing that the appellant was the best hei-

to Narasarajabhatta and that the respondent was looking after the duties only as a temporary Gumasta and that the entry of the name of Kesavabhatta as barawardar was a mistake, ordered the baraward to be made in the name of the appellant. Against this order the respondent files an appeal before the Deputy Commissioner who remanded the case to the Sub Division Officer On hearing the parties afresh the Sub Division Officer observing that Kesavabhatta's letter dated 30-7-95 written to Narasarajabhatta clearly discloses that he was only a Gumasta. That no order appointing Kesavabhatta as barawardar was forth-Coming and that the dismissal of Narasarajabhatta did not forfeit the "Hak" of the family to the office, ordered that the baraward should be made in the name of the appellant On appeal the Deputy Commissioner set aside the Sub Division officer's order for the reason that Narasarajabhatta did not, though he had every opportunity to do so, make any attempt to claim the office for so long ie from 1895-1910 and that the family 'Hak' had been forfeited by the order of appointment of Kesavabhatta to the archakship by the Taluk Office on 15-3-1895 and directed the baraward to be made in the name of the Respondent. Hence the present appeal.

Order.

I have perused the records and am satisfied that the order of the Deputy Commissioner reversing the order of the Sub Division officer in this matter is quite Correct. It is quite true that Narasaraja Bhatta was the original barawardar of the Archana Office and it is also true that Keshava Bhatta was doing the duties of that office only as a Gumastha But in 1895, on account of the misbehaviour of Narasarajabhatta he was dismissed from the office of Pujari and the vacant post was conferred on Keshava Bhatta who was

till then acting as Gumasta, by the Mugrai Superintendent notwithstanding that this Keshava Bhatta has been known to have been convicted for a "technical" offence of theft in the Belur temple. The order of the Mugrai Superintendent dated 29th January 1895 referring to the matter — particularly the opening sentences — makes it quite clear that the dismissal of Narasarajabhatta was final and irrevocable and that it was likewise intended to confer as a permanent measure the vacant office on Keshava Bhatta. This explains why the Barawards from that year Viz 1895 contain the name of Keshava Bhatta and not of Narasaraja Bhatta. It is quite unnecessary to assume as the Sub Division officer has done that the entry in the Baraward was a mistake — deliberate or otherwise

The matter becomes further clear when it is considered that when a few years later Keshava Bhatta was also dismissed for unsatisfactory conduct Viz.. gambling etc, the local officers set about finding the heir of Keshava Bhatta and not of Narasaraja bhatta for the office. In the end — but no doubt as a temporary measure — the post was given to Lakshmanabhatta, son of Keshava Bhatta

Keshava Bhatta and his son Lakshmana bhatta thus held the office between them from the year 1895 up to 1928. Narasaraja-Bhatta having died without issue in 1910 and having lost the office ~~for~~ nearly 15 years before his death, his widow Rukminiamma who professes to have adopted the appellant in 1912 cannot now claim an office which did not belong to her husband at the time of his death. It is futile to speculate whether if Narasarajabhatta had left an heir when he was dismissed from office in 1895 that heir would have been appointed to the post. There was no such heir when the office fell vacant and the vacancy was therefore filled up by the Mugrai Superintendent — by the

the appointment of another person. The appellant who claims through Nanasaraja Mudali no claim to the appointment in question and the appeal is, therefore dismissed

(Sd) S Hannanaya
Mugran Commissioner
12-5-33

Copy applied by — Mr T.S. Rajan - Swami Iyer
Copy applied on — 15-6-33
Copy prepared on
Copy delivered on — 22-6-33
Copied by — W Kumarasiri
Compared by — S Jayasundara
No of words — 860
Copying fee — 1-2-0.
Company fee — 0-3-0
1-5-0

a Copy"
Ramanathan
Manager
Mercantile Agency

No. 372 Encl 2 files
33-34

OFFICE OF THE MUZRAI COMMISSIONER IN MYSORE,

Bangalore, 11th Decem 18

Mcg 312-33-3



FROM

N. Madhava Rau, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
~~S. HIRIANNAIYA, Esq., M.A., B.L.,~~
Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore,
Bangalore.

To

S. Shamanna, Esq., P.A.,
Secretary to the Government of His Highness
the Maharaja of Mysore,
...Financial..... ...*Department.*

SIR,

Subject:- Appeal of Sri Rangaraja Bhatta - claim to archakship in the Sri Ranganathaswami temple at Seringapatan.

With reference to your Memo No.274/Muz. dated 31-8-33, calling for the records relating to the above subject, I have the honor to forward herewith the entire records received with the Mysore Deputy Commissioner's letter No.T.197/33 dated 5th December 1933 (copy enclosed) together with this office file No.App.6/31-32 dated 22nd May 1933 and to state that the facts

of the case are fully explained in this office note and order.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant

Muzrai Commissioner.

Manager
Muz. Comm's Office

Letter No.H.197/33 dated 6-12-33 from the Deputy Commissioner, Mysore District, to the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

Appeal of Sri Rangaraja Bhatta - archak of Sri Ranganathaswami temple seringapatam.

With reference to your Official Memorandum No.372 of 33-34 dated 19th September 1933 in the matter of the above appeal, I have the honor to forward herewith the file of connected records and to state that the facts of the case are explained in your order No.Appl.6 of 31-32 dated 22nd May 1933.

"COPY"

For Muzrai Commissioner.





4/8/34

1/8/34

Before the Govt. of H.H. the Maharaja of Mysore.

IN THE COURT OF THE (Financial Department)

Mujrai A. No) of. 33-84.
CASE NO. OF 19 —19 .

Appellant — Respondent.
~~PLAINTIFF~~ ~~DEFENDANT~~

Sri Ranga Raja Bhatta — Lakshmana Bhatta

VS.

1. I the ~~above~~ Respondent above named do, by these presents retain Mr. Messrs: B. Venkata Rao and N.V. Krishna Rao to appear for and conduct the above case on my behalf to Judgment.

2. I further empower him to do all the necessary acts in the above case and to execute any decree, order that may be passed in my behalf and to receive, from the court all documents, refunds, and all sums of money that I may be entitled to get and grant receipts therefor.

3 I also undertake to confirm and ratify all the legal acts done by the said or any other on his behalf in so doing

ಅನ್ವಯವಾದ ಲೆಕ್ಕ ಕೊಡತಕ್ಕದ್ದು

Accepted
N. V. Krishna Rao
B. Venkata Rao.
Advocate for Respondent
Dated 30. 5. 1934.

Signed before me and personally known to me.
Dated 1934.

SRI VENKATESWARA PRESS, MYSORE. 6-33

(19

Proceedings of the Government
of His Highness the Maharaja
of Mysore

Murrai Department.

Produced by the advocate Mr A.R. Narasimha Iyengar

Read:-

Correspondence ending with D.O. dated 5th August 1894 from Mr A. Ranga Swami Iyengar, Deputy Commissioner of the Mysore District regarding the theft of jewels that occurred in the Melkote temple on the night of the 16th August 1893.

Order thereon No 177-8/Mur. 7 11-93 dated, Bangalore 20th August 1894.

On the night of the 16th August 1893 jewels to the estimated value of Rs 4006-14-2 were stolen from the Anumana Sannidhi of the Sri Nara Simha Swami Temple in Melkote. The actual perpetrators of the offence have not been traced

But the Deputy Commissioner reports that the careful local inquiries instituted by him, personal inspection of the Temple and the evidence - oral and circumstantial - collected on the spot all point to the theft having been committed by the Temple Servants or by others with their active Co-operation, and he therefore recommends the dismissal of a few Servants, suspension of others who, it is believed have been either directly or indirectly concerned in the theft and also proposes to apportion the value of the property stolen among the Temple Servants in accordance with the Standing rules on the Subject.

2. On a full Consideration of the circumstances of the case, the Government agree in the views expressed by the Deputy Commissioner and approve of the measures

21

measures recommended by him. The Government accordingly direct that all the Sepoys who were in the Temple Service at the time of the theft and also the following servants of the Temple be dismissed forthwith:-

1. Archak Narasaraja Bhatta alias Thandeiraja Bhatta
2. Archak Narasimharaja Bhatta and his son Lakshmi Kantha Bhatta
3. Adyapaka Kanchi Varadiengar and his son Krishniengar
4. Stanik Ecuberumanar and his son Tirumeneekaahar
5. Stanik Tirumaniengar alias Chokappa.
6. Sabdogue Ananthaiaya alias Anantharamiah
7. Kavalgar Narasimha
8. Paricharak Dodda Rama Swamy
9. Paricharak Chikka Rama Swamy

b The under mentioned servants of the Temple will be suspended pending further enquiry

1. Ramaiya &c.

Muzrai Appeal No. 7/193[illegible]-34.

- -

Appellant Vs. Respondent.

Elumalakshamma Thatti

SUBJECT.

Appeal against the decision of the Muzrai Court in Muzrai Appeal No.6 of 1931-32 on the file of the Court rejecting the claim of the appellant for the archakship of Sri Vara Vinayaka of Sri Ranganathaswami temple at Srirangam.

The respondent called on 31st August 1934. Sri [illegible] Iyer, B.A., B.L., Advocate for the appellant and Sri [illegible] Rao, Advocate for the respondent were heard in person.

O R D E R

Government see no reason to interfere with the correct orders of the Deputy Commissioner, Trichinopoly in the matter.

988/Mis 312-33-4 & 10-1-35.
Copy of the above is forwarded to Mr. A. R. Nageswara Iyer B.A.B.L. Advocate for the appellant

By order
(Sd). R. Ranga Rao
Chief Secretary to Govt.

989 & 10-1-35. 988-33
Copy of the above is forwarded to Mr. K. V. Krishna Rao Advocate for the respondent.

By order
Sd. R. Ranga Rao
Chief Secretary to Govt.

980/Ins 182 files & 10-1-35. Chief Secretary to Govt.
Copy of the above is forwarded to [illegible]

Lan Lab Museum

action The records. received

372 / 33 Kb 9 18. 12. 1933

The returned

By order

for Chief Secretary

Muz. 21]

D. No 133

6 Cahiers

Before the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

Muz Appeal No. 7 of 1933-34

Appellant.	Vs.	Respondent
Sri Ranga raja Bhatta		Belur Lakshmana Bhatta

Subject.

Appeal against the decision of the m.c. in Muz Appl No 6 of 1931-32 on the file of this Court re: the claim of the Appellant for the archakship of Sri Swamie Sannidhi of Sri Ranganatha swamie temple at Seringapatam.

The case was called on 4.8.1934 - Mr A.R. Narasimha Iyer, B.A.B.L Advocate for the appellant Mr H.V. Krishna Rao Advocate for the respondent Were present and were heard.

over.

Govt see no reason to interfere with the concurrent views of the D.C and the M.C. in the matter.

WD0580—GPB—250—10.8.22

TYPING

Copy of the order is forwarded to the A
Dyer Bot. B.A. advocate for the appellant

B.O

7/1/35
Forbes Sec

§ 89 9/D-1-35
Copy to the H.V. Krishnarao Advocate
for the respondent

B.O
7/1/35
Forbes Sec

§ 90 Municipal 10-1-35
Copy to M.C. with compliments for
information and necessary action
the records received with this letter
in no 372/33-34 on 18/12/35 are herewith
returned-

B.O
7/1/35
Forbes Sec

Ass

D.No 304 27
34-35

Received in Court
12
13/9/34.
2/13/9



Before the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

D.No 169

Muzrai Appeal 6 of 31--32. Misc No's 1 under 70 of 33-34.

Sri Rangaraja Bhatta .. Appellant

Vs.

Lakshmana Bhatta .. Respondent.

Appellant's memo.

As directed by this Hon'ble Court, the appellant produces herewith the ~~dxx~~ endorsement granted appointing him as the archak of the Melkote Temple.

Bommanahalli
advocate for appellant

Bangalore,
10-9-34.

Muz Appl No 7 of 32-33 was heard by the Second Member of Council; is with the Member for judgment being written up. Terms in enclosed endorsement is with the [illegible] The appellant is posted permanently to the middle class post in Sri Cadalavanga Narasimhaswami [illegible] (Ref. in his (second) Mysore D.O.'s order dt 14-7-33) -

If appd, this will be Second W.P.A. to the Second Member of Council

[illegible] in the appld. Dec.

Yes please
14/9

C 661
32-33

ಸಿ.ಆಸ್.1053/32 ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ.ಕೆಂಚಪ್ಪ ಬಿನ್ ಲೇ

ಕ್ರಿಷ್ಣಂ ಅವರು 20-7-32 ನೇ ಸೋಮ ಮಂ. ಗೆ [illegible]

ಲ್ಲಂಬಾಣಿ ಆಸ್ಪತ್ರೆಯಿಂದ ಮಾಲ್ಲಿ ಬಿಟ್ಟಿಕೊಂಡ

ಬಂದಿದ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಿಲ್ಲಿಯನ್ನು

Arunadhara

29) ಶಾ 31-7-32

Medical